6614. Adulteration of elixir of iron, quinine, and strychnine, and adulteration and misbranding of chloroform liniment. U. S. * * * v. John S. Clemence. Plea of guilty: Fine, \$40. (F. & D. No. 8609. I. S. Nos. 4810-m, 4902-m, 4587-m.)

On April 16, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the police court of said District an information against John S. Clemence, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendent did offer for sale and sell, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on May 31, 1917, and February 8, 1917, at the District aforesaid, a quantity of an article labeled in part, "Elixir of Iron, Quinine and Strychnine," which was adulterated, and on February 8, 1917, a quantity of an article labeled in part, "Chloroform Liniment, Alcohol 49%, Chloroform 144 minims in 1 fl. oz.," which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the articles by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

ELIXIR OF IRON, QUININE, AND STRYCHNINE.

Sale of May 31.	Sale of February 8.
6	6. 26
Present.	Present.
	55.4
·	70
	6

Adulteration of the elixir of iron, quinine, and strychnine was alleged in the information for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the National Formulary, and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the tests laid down in said National Formulary, official at the time of investigation of the article, in that it contained in 1,000 mils, total alkaloids equivalent to 6.0 grams of 6.26 grams, as the case might be, of quinine hydrochlorid, whereas said National Formulary provides that it shall contain in 1,000 mils, 8.750 grams of hydrochlorid; and in that it contained sugar, which is not mentioned as an ingredient of elixir of iron, quinine, and strychnine in said National Formulary; and the standard of strength, quality, and purity of the article was not declared on the container thereof.

Adulteration of the chloroform liniment was alleged for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia, and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the tests laid down in the said Pharmacopoeia, official at the time of investigation of the article, in that in 1,000 mils of the article there were 146 mils of chloroform, whereas said Pharmacopoeia provides that in 1,000 mils of the article there shall be 300 mils of chloroform, and the strength, quality, and purity was not declared on the container thereof.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Alcohol 49% Chloroform 144 minims in 1 fl. oz.," borne on the label attached to the bottle containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading, in that it represented that the article contained 49 per cent of alcohol and contained 144 minims of chloroform to the fluid ounce, whereas, in truth and fact, it did not contain 49 per cent of alcohol, and did not contain 144 minims of chloroform